

Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Summary

Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)

Section A: Overview & Summary Information

Date Investment First Submitted: 2010-09-16
Date of Last Change to Activities: 2012-06-12
Investment Auto Submission Date: 2012-02-16
Date of Last Investment Detail Update: 2012-02-16
Date of Last Exhibit 300A Update: 2012-02-16
Date of Last Revision: 2012-06-12

Agency: 012 - Department of Labor **Bureau:** 25 - Departmental Management

Investment Part Code: 01

Investment Category: 00 - Agency Investments

1. Name of this Investment: OASAM - HR Line of Business Shared Service Center (HRLOB SSC)

2. Unique Investment Identifier (Ull): 012-000003645

Section B: Investment Detail

- 1. Provide a brief summary of the investment, including a brief description of the related benefit to the mission delivery and management support areas, and the primary beneficiary(ies) of the investment. Include an explanation of any dependencies between this investment and other investments.**

The DOL Human Resources Line of Business (HRLOB) Shared Service Center (SSC) funds an investment to migrate DOL's human resources (HR) information systems to a Federal SSC. The SSC will replace DOL's internal systems for personnel action processing, time and attendance, and HR reporting. Migrating to an SSC will enable DOL to focus on managing its HR processes rather than its HR systems. Today, DOL bears all the costs associated with maintaining its internal HR systems. Yet these internal systems simply replicate functionality provided by the SSC. By moving to the shared hardware, software, development, and support infrastructure of an SSC, DOL will reduce its costs and be able to make better use of information technology staff resources. DOL will benefit by replacing antiquated technology with a SSC's modern architecture. The end result will be a system that is more reliable, more secure, and easier to integrate with other technology initiatives. The SSC will provide new and improved functionality that will significantly reduce HR staff workload. For example, up-front transaction validation will reduce both the number of errors that occur and the amount of time spent reconciling between different systems. Employee self-service will allow a number of transactions to be entered in the front office, avoiding time-consuming routing and data entry on the back-end. As the project design phase has not yet begun, dependencies on other investments are not yet certain. There have been significant changes to the schedule and the estimated cost since the FY12 submission. The project

schedule slipped by 12 months due to a delay in FY11 funding that delayed the execution of an interagency agreement with the SSC. The funding estimates have also been revised to more accurately reflect the scope of the project. The revised estimate is based on the responses to the RFP and the need for the SSC to build custom functionality. DOL is funding the migration efforts in advance by transferring project funding to the SSC in FY11. This will support the SSC work to be accomplished in FY12 and a portion of FY13. The delay in receiving FY11 funds has coincidentally mitigated the impact of work delays due to a likely FY12 Continuing Resolution. Once funding is approved for FY12, it will be used to complete the migration efforts in FY13, and will reduce the funds needed for FY13. An updated cost benefit reflects that this is still a sound investment.

2. How does this investment close in part or in whole any identified performance gap in support of the mission delivery and management support areas? Include an assessment of the program impact if this investment isn't fully funded.

DOL's HR systems are no longer supported by the software vendor. Lacking vendor support, the patchwork of maintenance and upgrades are increasingly difficult, costly, and time consuming. If a failure occurred in these fragile systems, issue investigation and resolution could be significantly hampered and delayed by the lack of vendor support. This is an unacceptable risk for a system that has been designated Critical to the continuation of DOL Mission Essential Functions in the event of an emergency. In addition, the system is at greater risk from unpatched security vulnerabilities, which, if exploited, could expose personally identifiable information, financial data, and payroll data. By comparison, the SSC uses current versions of industry-standard software, and has active support agreements with the vendors. DOL does not have an active disaster recovery environment for its HR systems. As described above, this puts DOL Mission Essential Functions at risk in the event of a system failure or disaster. The SSC maintains full disaster recovery environments for all of its system components, including data replication to avoid data loss and rapid system restoration after the disaster. The current, in-house systems also cannot support new government regulations, policies, and initiatives. On a functional level, it is increasingly difficult to modify the system to keep up with significant HR changes, such as the new Pathways Program. Technologically, the systems cannot support initiatives such as the cloud computing directives in the Federal CIO's 25 Point Implementation Plan and the PIV-card authentication mandated in OMB M-11-11. Finally, if the investment is not funded, DOL cannot bring itself into compliance with the OMB mandate to migrate to an SSC. OMB has determined that these migrations are beneficial to taxpayers, by reducing expenditures on duplicative systems. If the investment is not funded, DOL HR system costs will be higher than they need to be.

3. Provide a list of this investment's accomplishments in the prior year (PY), including projects or useful components/project segments completed, new functionality added, or operational efficiency achieved.

HRLoB SSC is in the planning phase and has accomplished the following in the Prior Year. Project Charter signed and approved. Request for Proposal issued. Shared Service Provider selected. Interagency Agreement between Department of Labor and Shared Service Provider executed.

4. Provide a list of planned accomplishments for current year (CY) and budget year (BY).

Re-plan project following 10 month delay in PY funding and 11 month delay in project kick-off. Complete Fit Gap Analysis. Complete Integrated Baseline Review. Establish project baseline cost using results from certified SSC cost proposals and the Fit Gap Analysis. Implement a web-based system that includes the function currently residing on the DOL's PeopleSoft Version 7.5.1 system. Implement Oracle licenses for 16,000 employees. Purchase network hardware and establish IPsec tunnels. Implementation of the Web-based Time and Attendance system: webTA. Interface the HR solution with the payroll system at the National Finance System (NFC).

5. Provide the date of the Charter establishing the required Integrated Program Team (IPT) for this investment. An IPT must always include, but is not limited to: a qualified fully-dedicated IT program manager, a contract specialist, an information technology specialist, a security specialist and a business process owner before OMB will approve this program investment budget. IT Program Manager, Business Process Owner and Contract Specialist must be Government Employees.

2011-08-17

Section C: Summary of Funding (Budget Authority for Capital Assets)

1.

Table I.C.1 Summary of Funding

	PY-1 & Prior	PY 2011	CY 2012	BY 2013
Planning Costs:	\$1.2	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
DME (Excluding Planning) Costs:	\$0.0	\$8.5	\$3.0	\$3.2
DME (Including Planning) Govt. FTEs:	\$0.2	\$0.2	\$1.1	\$1.2
Sub-Total DME (Including Govt. FTE):	\$1.4	\$8.7	\$4.1	\$4.4
O & M Costs:	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
O & M Govt. FTEs:	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Sub-Total O & M Costs (Including Govt. FTE):	0	0	0	0
Total Cost (Including Govt. FTE):	\$1.4	\$8.7	\$4.1	\$4.4
Total Govt. FTE costs:	\$0.2	\$0.2	\$1.1	\$1.2
# of FTE rep by costs:	1	1	9	10
Total change from prior year final President's Budget (\$)		\$5.5	\$-5.9	
Total change from prior year final President's Budget (%)		173.10%	-58.70%	

2. If the funding levels have changed from the FY 2012 President's Budget request for PY or CY, briefly explain those changes:

The investment's PY funding estimates have been revised (increased) to more accurately reflect the scope of the investment. The revised estimate is based on the responses to the RFP and the need for the SSC to build/customize new functionality to meet DOL's business mission needs. A delay in budget authority also impacted SSC ability to complete critical tasks. The increased funding will allow the SSC to execute multiple activities and complete some of the critical tasks simultaneously.

Section D: Acquisition/Contract Strategy (All Capital Assets)

Table I.D.1 Contracts and Acquisition Strategy

Contract Type	EVM Required	Contracting Agency ID	Procurement Instrument Identifier (PIID)	Indefinite Delivery Vehicle (IDV) Reference ID	IDV Agency ID	Solicitation ID	Ultimate Contract Value (\$M)	Type	PBSA ?	Effective Date	Actual or Expected End Date
---------------	--------------	-----------------------	--	--	---------------	-----------------	-------------------------------	------	--------	----------------	-----------------------------

NONE

2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:

All of the HRLOB SSC contractual agreements are interagency agreements with other federal agencies. The project management and over-sight agreement are with the Office of Personal Management. The Shared Service Provider agreement will be with the Department of Treasury. All of the investment's contracts require and/or will require the use of earned value management.

Exhibit 300B: Performance Measurement Report

Section A: General Information

Date of Last Change to Activities: 2012-06-12

Section B: Project Execution Data

Table II.B.1 Projects

Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Start Date	Project Completion Date	Project Lifecycle Cost (\$M)
364501	HR Line of Business Migration	HR Migration to a Shared Service Center.			

Activity Summary

Roll-up of Information Provided in Lowest Level Child Activities

Project ID	Name	Total Cost of Project Activities (\$M)	End Point Schedule Variance (in days)	End Point Schedule Variance (%)	Cost Variance (\$M)	Cost Variance (%)	Total Planned Cost (\$M)	Count of Activities
364501	HR Line of Business Migration							

Key Deliverables

Project Name	Activity Name	Description	Planned Completion Date	Projected Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Duration (in days)	Schedule Variance (in days)	Schedule Variance (%)
364501	Fit/Gap Analysis	Fit/Gap Analysis Requirements Development and Fit/Gap Analysis for Migrated System	2012-03-01	2012-06-30		121	-183	-151.24%
364501	Project Plan	Develop integrated project schedule	2012-03-01	2012-04-30		29	-183	-631.03%

Key Deliverables								
Project Name	Activity Name	Description	Planned Completion Date	Projected Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Duration (in days)	Schedule Variance (in days)	Schedule Variance (%)
364501	Data Mapping	collaboration with Shared Service Provider Data Mapping development and migration	2012-09-01	2012-09-01		184	0	0.00%

Section C: Operational Data

Table II.C.1 Performance Metrics								
Metric Description	Unit of Measure	FEA Performance Measurement Category Mapping	Measurement Condition	Baseline	Target for PY	Actual for PY	Target for CY	Reporting Frequency

NONE